arXiv:0903.0158v1 [math.FA] 1 Mar 2009

RENORMINGS OF THE DUAL OF JAMES TREE SPACES

ANTONIO AVILÉS

Abstract. We discuss renorming properties of the dual of a James tree space JT. We present examples of weakly Lindelöf determined JT such that JT^* admits neither strictly convex nor Kadec renorming and of weakly compactly generated JT such that JT^* does not admit Kadec renorming although it is strictly convexifiable.

The norm of a Banach space is said to be locally uniformly rotund (LUR) if for every for every x_0 with $\|x_0\| = 1$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|x - x_0\| < \varepsilon$ whenever $\|\frac{x+x_0}{2}\| > 1 - \delta$. A lot of research during the last decades has been devoted to understanding which Banach spaces have an equivalent LUR norm, and this is still a rather active line of research. In this note we are concerned with this problem in the case of dual Banach spaces. It is a consequence of a result of Fabian and Godefroy [7] that the dual of every Asplund Banach space (that is, a Banach space such that every separable subspace has a separable dual) admits an equivalent norm which is locally uniformly rotund. It is natural to ask whether, more generally, the dual of every Banach space not containing ℓ_1 admits an equivalent LUR norm. We shall give counterexamples to this question by looking at the dual of James tree spaces JT over different trees T. However all these examples are nonseparable, and the problem remains open for the separable case. It was established by Troyanski [18] that a Banach space admits an equivalent LUR norm if and only if it admits an equivalent strictly convex norm and also an equivalent Kadec norm. We recall that a norm is strictly convex if its sphere does not contain any proper segment and it is a Kadec norm if the weak and the norm topologies coincide on its sphere.

In Section 1 we shall recall the definition of the spaces JT and the main properties that we shall need.

In Section 2 we remark that the space JT^* has a LUR renorming whenever JT is separable, so they cannot provide any counterexample for the separable case. We also point out the relation which exists between the renorming properties of JT^* and those of $C_0(\bar{T})$, the space of continuous functions on the completed tree $\bar{T}$ vanishing at ∞. Haydon [10] gave satisfactory characterizations of those trees Υ for which $C_0(\Upsilon)$ admits LUR, strictly convex or Kadec equivalent norm. We show that if $C_0(\bar{T})$ has a LUR (respectively strictly convex) norm then also does JT^*, and that, on the contrary, if JT^* has an equivalent Kadec norm, then so does

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46B03,46B26.

Key words and phrases. LUR, Kadec norm, strictly convex norm, James tree.

Author supported by FPU grant and grant MTM2005-08379 from MEC of Spain and grant 00690/PI/2004 of Fundación Séneca of Región de Murcia.

$C_0(\bar{T})$. We do not know about any of the converses.

In Section 3 we study the case when JT is weakly compactly generated. The dual of every weakly compactly generated space is strictly convexifiable, however we shall show that for some trees, JT is weakly compactly generated but JT^* does not admit any equivalent Kadec norm.

In Section 4 we provide a sufficient condition on a tree T in order that JT^* does not admit neither a strictly convex nor a Kadec renorming, namely that it is an infinitely branchig Baire tree. This is inspired by a construction of Haydon which can be found in [1] of the dual of a weakly Lindelöf determined Banach space with no equivalent strictly convex norm (this space contains nevertheless ℓ_1). Similar ideas appear also in other Haydon's papers like [9] and [10]. If we consider a particular tree constructed by Todorčević [16], then the Banach space that we construct is in addition weakly Lindelöf determined. The short proof of the properties of the mentioned tree of Todorčević presented in [16] is based on metamathematical arguments, while there exists another proof of Haydon [9] using games. We include another proof in Section 5, purely combinatorial.

As we mentioned, it is an open question whether the dual of every separable Banach space X not containing ℓ_1 admits an equivalent LUR norm. For such a space X, the bidual ball $B_{X^{**}}$ is a separable Rosenthal compact in the weak* topology (that is, it is a pointwise compact set of Baire one functions on a Polish space). Hence, the problem is a particular instance of the more general whether $C(K)$ is LUR renormable whenever K is a separable Rosenthal compact. Todorčević [17] has recently constructed a nonseparable Rosenthal compact K such that $C(K)$ is not LUR renormable, while Haydon, Moltó and Orihuela [11] have shown that if K is a separable pointwise compact set of Baire one functions with countably many discontinuities on a Polish space, then $C(K)$ is LUR renormable.

This research was done while visiting the National Technical University of Athens. We want to express our gratitude to the Department of Mathematics for its hospitality. Our special thanks go to Spiros Argyros, the discussion with whom is the origin of the present work.

1. General properties of James tree spaces

In this section we shall give the definition and state some well known of James tree spaces. We recall that a tree is a partially ordered set $(T, \prec)$ such that for every $t \in T$, the set $\{s \in T : s \prec t\}$ is well ordered by $\prec$. A chain is a subset of T which is totally ordered by $\prec$ and a segment is a chain σ with the extra property that whenever $s \prec t \prec u$ and $s, u \in \sigma$ then $t \in \sigma$. For a tree T we consider the James tree space JT which is the completion of $c_{00}(T) = \{f \in \mathbb{R}^T : |supp(f)| < \omega\}$ endowed with the norm

$$\|f\| = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{t \in \sigma_i} f(t) \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}$$

where the supremum runs over all finite families of disjoint segments $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ of the tree T. The space JT is ℓ_2-saturated, that is, every subspace contains a copy of ℓ_2 and in particular JT does not contain ℓ_1, cf. [8] and [2] and also [12].

An element $h^* \in \mathbb{R}^T$ induces a linear map $c_{00}(T) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $h^*(x) = \sum_{t\in T} h^*(t)x(t)$. When such a linear map is bounded for the norm of JT, then h^* defines an element of the dual space JT^*. This is the case when h^* is the characteristic function of a segment σ of the tree, χ^*_σ, for which we have indeed $\|\chi^*_\sigma\| = 1$. Namely, if we take an element $x \in c_{00}(T)$ of norm less than or equal to one we will have, taking only the segment σ in the definition of the norm of JT, that $|\sum_{i\in\sigma} x(i)| \leq 1$, and this is the action of χ^*_σ on x.

Proposition 1. *If $t_1, \dots, t_n$ are incomparable nodes of the tree T and we have $f_1, \dots, f_n \in c_{00}(T)$ such that all the elements on the support of f_i are greater than or equal to t_i, shortly $|f_i| \leq \chi_{[t_i,\infty)}$, then*

$$\|f_1 + \cdots + f_n\| = \left(\|f_1\|^2 + \cdots + \|f_n\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Proof: Every segment of the tree T intersects at most one of the segments $[t_i, \infty)$, so the set whose supremum computes the norm of $f_1 + \cdots + f_n$ consists exactly of the numbers of the form $\left(\sum_1^n \lambda_i^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ where each λ_i is one of the numbers whose supremum computes the norm of f_i. $\square$

An antichain is a subset S of T such that every two different elements of S are incomparable.

Definition 2. Let S be an antichain of the tree T. We define X_S as the subspace of JT generated by all $x \in c_{00}(T)$ whose support is contained in $[s, \infty)$ for some $s \in S$. For an element $t \in T$, we denote $X_t = X_{\{t\}}$.

The properties of the subspaces X_S are the following:

(1) $X_S = \left(\bigoplus_{s\in S} X_s\right)_{\ell_2}$. This is Proposition 1.

(2) X_S is a complemented subspace of JT, indeed we have a norm one projection $\pi_S : JT \longrightarrow X_S$ which is defined for an element $x \in c_{00}(T)$ setting $\pi_S(x)_t = x_t$ if $t \succeq s$ for some $s \in S$ and $\pi_S(x)_t = 0$ otherwise. First, π_S reduces the norm because if we have a family of segments providing a sum for computing the norm of $\pi_S(x)$, then we can assume that every segment is contained in some $[s, \infty)$ for $s \in S$, and then, the same segments will provide the same sum for the computation of the norm of x. Second, clearly $\pi_S(x) = x$ if $x \in X_S$.

(3) The dual map of the operator π_S defined above allows us to consider X_S^* as a subspace of JT^* since $\pi_S^* : X_S^* \longrightarrow JT^*$ is an isometric embedding because π_S is a projection of norm one. In this way X_S^* is identified with the range of π_S^*, which equals the set of all elements of JT^* which take the same values on x and on $\pi_S(x)$ for every $x \in JT$ (in particular, $\chi^*_{[t,u)} \in X_s^*$ whenever $s \preceq t$). Again, X_S^* is a complemented subspace, since if we call

$i_S : X_S \longrightarrow JT$ to the inclusion, then $i_S^* : JT^* \longrightarrow X_S^*$ is a projection of norm one. Taking duals in (1), we obtain

$$X_S^* = \left(\bigoplus_{s\in S} X_s^*\right)_{\ell_2}$$

(4) Taking duals again, we have an isometric embedding $i_S^{**} : X_S^{**} \longrightarrow JT^{**}$ and a projection of norm one $\pi_S^{**} : JT^{**} \longrightarrow X_S^{**}$ and again

$$X_S^{**} = \left(\bigoplus_{s\in S} X_s^{**}\right)_{\ell_2}$$

2. THE RELATION WITH $C_0(\bar{T})$

We notice first that James tree spaces JT cannot be used to provide examples of separable Banach spaces with non LUR renormable dual. Let us denote by $\bar{T}$, the completed tree of T, the tree whose nodes are the initial segments of the tree T (that is, the segments σ of T with the property that whenever $s \prec t$ and $t \in \sigma$ then $s \in \sigma$) ordered by inclusion. We view $T \subset \bar{T}$ by identifying every $t \in T$ with the initial segment $\{s \in T : s \preceq t\}$. A result of Brackebusch states that for every tree T, JT^{**} is isometric to $J\bar{T}$ where $\bar{T}$ is the completed tree of T. We shall need also that by [5, Theorem VII.2.7], if Y^* is a subspace of a weakly compactly generated space, then Y has an equivalent LUR norm.

Proposition 3. *Let T be a tree and X be a separable subspace of JT, then X^{**} is a subspace of a weakly compactly generated and hence, X^* admits an equivalent LUR norm.*

PROOF: Let T_1 be a countable set (that we view as a subtree of the tree T) such that $X \subset \overline{span}(\{\chi_{\{t\}} : t \in T_1\}) \cong JT_1$. Since T_1 is a countable tree, it has countable height $ht(T_1) = \alpha < \omega_1$ and the height of the completed tree cannot be essentially larger, $ht(\bar{T_1}) \leq \alpha + 1 < \omega_1$, so in particular, $\bar{T_1}$ is countable union of antichains and $J\bar{T_1}$ is weakly compactly generated. Finally, $JT_1^{**} \cong J\bar{T_1}$, so X^{**} is a subspace of a weakly compactly generated space and so X^* is LUR renormable. $\square$

Let us recall now how Brackebusch identifies the basic elements of $J\bar{T}$ inside JT^{**} in order to get an isometry. For every initial segment of the tree T, $s \in \bar{T}$, we have the basic element $e_s \in JT^{**}$ whose action on every $x^* \in JT^*$ is given by:

$$(\star) \quad e_s(x^*) = \lim_{t\in s} x^*(\chi_{\{t\}}).$$

The initial segment s is well ordered, so when we write $a = \lim_{t\in s} a_t$ we mean that for every neighborhood U of a there exists $t_0 \in s$ such that $a_t \in U$ whenever $t \geq t_0$. We consider a tree Υ endowed with its natural locally compact topology with intervals of the form $(s, s']$ as basic open sets, and $\Upsilon \cup \{\infty\}$ its one-point compactification. Let us first notice the following fact:

Proposition 4. *The set* $\{e_s : s \in \bar{T}\} \cup \{0\}$ *is homeomorphic in the weak** *topology of* JT^{**} *to the space* $\bar{T} \cup \{\infty\}$ *through the natural correspondence.*

Proof: Since $\bar{T} \cup \{\infty\}$ is compact, it is enough to check that the natural identification $\bar{T} \cup \{\infty\} \longrightarrow \{e_s : s \in \bar{T}\} \cup \{0\}$ is continuous. The fact that it is continuous at the points $t \in \bar{T}$ follows immediately from ($\star$). For the continuity at ∞ we take V a neighborhood of 0 in the weak* topology and we shall see that the set $L = \{t \in \bar{T} : t \notin V\}$ is a relatively compact subset of $\bar{T}$. We shall prove that every transfinite sequence $\{t_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ of elements of L has a cofinal subsequence which converges to a point of L (this is a stronger principle than that every net has a convergent subnet and holds on those sets with scattered compact closure). A partition principle due to Dushnik and Miller [6, Theorem 5.22] yields that either there is an infinite subsequence $\{t_{\alpha_n} : n \in \omega\}$ of incomparable elements or there is a cofinal subsequence in which every couple of elements is comparable. The first possibility is excluded because we know that a family of vectors of $J\bar{T}$ corresponding to an antichain is isometric to the basis of ℓ_2, and in particular it weakly (and hence weak*) converges to 0, contradicting that V is a weak* neighborhood of 0. In the latter case, the cofinal subsequence is contained in a branch of the tree which is a well ordered set, and again the same partition principle of Dushkin and Miller [6, Theorem 5.22] implies that it has a further cofinal and increasing subsequence, and this subsequence converges to its lowest upper bound in $\bar{T}$. $\square$

Proposition 4 allows us to view every element $x^* \in JT^*$ as a continuous function on $\bar{T} \cup \{\infty\}$ vanishing at ∞, and thus to define an operator,

$$F : JT^* \longrightarrow C_0(\bar{T}).$$

Recall that $C_0(\bar{T})$ stands for the space of real valued continuous functions on $\bar{T} \cup \{\infty\}$ vanishing at ∞, endowed with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Haydon [10] has characterized the classes of trees Υ for which the space $C_0(\Upsilon)$ admits equivalent LUR, Kadec or strictly convex norms. Notice that F is an operator of norm 1, since $\|F(x^*)\|_\infty = \sup\{|e_s(x^*)| : s \in \bar{T}\} \leq \|x^*\|$.

Theorem 5. *Let* T *be a tree.*

1. *If* $C_0(\bar{T})$ *admits an equivalent strictly convex norm, then* JT^* *also admits an equivalent strictly convex norm.*
2. *If* $C_0(\bar{T})$ *admits an equivalent LUR norm, then* JT^* *also admits an equivalent LUR norm.*
3. *If* JT^* *admits an equivalent Kadec norm, then* $C_0(\bar{T})$ *also admits an equivalent Kadec norm.*

PROOF: Part (1) follows from the fact that F is a one-to-one operator and one-to-one operators transfer strictly convex renorming. Moreover, F has the additional property that the dual operator $F^* : C_0(\bar{T})^* \longrightarrow JT^{**} \cong J\bar{T}$ has dense range, because for every dirac measure δ_s, $s \in \bar{T}$ we have that $F^*(\delta_s) = e_s$. One to one operators whose dual has dense range transfer LUR renorming [15], so this proves part (2). Concerning part (3), we observe that if $|||\cdot|||$ is an equivalent Kadec norm on JT^* and $\rho : \bar{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\rho(s) = \inf\{|||\chi^*_\sigma||| : s \subset \sigma\}$$

then $\rho : \bar{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an increasing function with no bad points in the sense of [10], just by the same argument as in [10, Proposition 3.2]. Hence, by [10, Theorem 6.1], $C_0(\bar{T})$ admits an equivalent Kadec norm. $\square$

We do not know whether any of the converses of Theorem 5 holds true. Concerning part (3), no transfer result for Kadec norms is available. In the other two cases, it would be natural to try to imitate Haydon's arguments in [10] using the function $\rho(s) = \inf\{|||\chi^*_\sigma||| : s \subset \sigma\}$ on JT^*. But these arguments rely on the consideration of certain special functions $f \in C_0(\Upsilon)$ which are not available anymore in JT^* which is a rather smaller space.

3. When JT is weakly compactly generated

In this section we analyze the case when JT is weakly compactly generated. This property is characterized in terms of the tree as it is shown in the following result which can be found in [3]:

Theorem 6. *For a tree T the following are equivalent*

1. *JT is weakly compactly generated.*
2. *JT is weakly countably determined.*
3. *T is the union of countably many antichains.*
4. *$T = \bigcup_{n<\omega} S_n$ where for every $n < \omega$, S_n contains no infinite chain.*

A tree is union is the union of countably many antichains if and only if it is $\mathbb{Q}$-embeddable, cf. [16, Theorem 9.1]. It happens that for a tree T satisfying the conditions of Theorem 6, the renorming properties of JT^* depend on whether the completed tree $\bar{T}$ is still the union of countably many antichains.

Theorem 7. *Let T be a tree which is the union of countably many antichains. The following are equivalent:*

1. *$\bar{T}$ is also the union of countably many antichains.*
2. *JT^* admits an equivalent Kadec norm.*
3. *JT^* admits an equivalent LUR norm.*

The dual of every weakly compactly generated space admits always an equivalent strictly convex norm since, by the Amir-Lindenstrauss Theorem there is a one-to-one operator into $c_0(\Gamma)$. Hence, that (2) and (3) are equivalent is a consequence of the result of Troyanski mentioned in the introduction. On the other hand, we also mentioned in Section 2 the result of Brackebusch [4] that for any tree T, JT^{**} is isometric to $J\bar{T}$. Hence, if (1) is verified, then JT^{**} is weakly compactly generated and it follows then by [5, Theorem VII.2.7] that JT^* admits an equivalent LUR norm. Our goal is therefore to prove that (2) implies (1) but before passing to this we give an example of a tree T_0 which is the union of countably many antichains but the completion $\bar{T}_0$ does not share this property, so that after Theorem 7 JT_0 is a weakly compactly generated space not containing ℓ_1 and such that JT_0^* does not admit any equivalent Kadec norm, namely

$$T_0 = \sigma'\mathbb{Q} = \{t \subset \mathbb{Q} : (t, <) \text{ is well ordered and } \max(t) \text{ exists}\},$$

where $t \prec s$ if t is a proper initial segment of s. For every rational number $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, the set $S_q = \{t \in T_0 : \max(t) = q\}$ is an antichain of T_0, and $T_0 = \bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} S_q$. The completed tree $\bar{T}_0$ can be identified with the following tree:

$$T_1 = \sigma\mathbb{Q} = \{t \subset \mathbb{Q} : (t, <) \text{ is well ordered}\},$$

the identification sending every $t \in T_1$ to the initial segment $\{t' \in T_0 : t' \prec t\}$ of T_0. The fact that T_1 is not countable union of antichains is a well known result due to Kurepa [14], cf. also [16]. The reason is the following: suppose there existed $f : T_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^{-1}(n)$ is an antichain. Then we could construct by recursion a sequence $t_1 \prec t_2 \prec \cdots$ inside T_1 and a sequence of rational numbers $q_1 > q_2 > \cdots$ such that $q_i > \sup(t_i)$ and $f(t_{n+1}) = \min\{f(t) : t_n \prec t, \sup(t) < q_n\}$. The consideration of the element $t_\omega = \bigcup_{n<\omega} t_n$ leads to a contradiction.

Lemma 8. *Let T be any tree and suppose that there exists an equivalent Kadec norm on JT, then there exist*

(a) *a countable partition of $\bar{T}$, $\bar{T} = \bigcup_{n<\omega} T_n$ and*
(b) *a function $F : \bar{T} \longrightarrow 2^T$ which associates to each initial segment $\sigma \in \bar{T}$ a finite set $F(\sigma)$ of immediate successors of σ,*

such that for every $n < \omega$ and for every infinite chain $\sigma_1 \prec \sigma_2 \prec \cdots$ contained in T_n there exists $k_0 < \omega$ such that $F(\sigma_k) \cap \sigma_{k+1} \neq \emptyset$ for every $k > k_0$.

Proof: Let $|||\cdot|||$ be an equivalent Kadec norm on JT^*.

Claim: For every $\sigma \in \bar{T}$ there exists a natural number n_σ and a finite set $F(\sigma) \subset T$ of immediate successors of σ such that $\mid |||\chi^*_\sigma||| - |||\chi^*_{\sigma'}||| \mid \geq \frac{1}{n_\sigma}$ for every $\sigma' \in \bar{T}$ such that $\sigma \prec \sigma'$ and $F(\sigma) \cap \sigma' = \emptyset$.

Proof of the claim: Suppose that there existed $\sigma \in \bar{T}$ failing the claim. Then, we can find recursively a sequence $\{q_n\}$ of different immediate succesors of σ together with a sequence $\{\sigma_n\}$ of elements of $\bar{T}$ such that $\sigma \cup \{q_n\} \preceq \sigma_n$ and

$$\mid |||\chi^*_\sigma||| - |||\chi^*_{\sigma_n}||| \mid < \frac{1}{n}.$$

Now, $\{\sigma'_n = \sigma_n \setminus \sigma\}$ is a sequence of incomparable segments of T, so the sequence $\{\chi^*_{\sigma'_n}\}$ is isometric to the base of ℓ_2 and in particular it weakly converges to 0. Hence the sequence $\chi^*_{\sigma_n} = \chi^*_\sigma + \chi^*_{\sigma'_n}$ weakly converges to χ^*_σ, however it does not converge in norm since $\|\chi^*_{\sigma'_n}\| = 1$ for every n. Finally, since $|||\chi^*_{\sigma_n}|||$ converges to $|||\chi^*_\sigma|||$ we obtain, after normalizing, a contradiction with the fact that $|||\cdot|||$ is a Kadec norm.

From the claim we get the function F and also the countable decomposition setting $T_n = \{\sigma \in \bar{T} : n_\sigma = n\}$. Suppose that we have an increasing sequence $\sigma_1 \prec \sigma_2 \prec \cdots$ inside T_n. We observe that whenever $F(\sigma_k) \cap \sigma_{k+1} = \emptyset$ we have that $\left| |||\chi^*_{\sigma_k}||| - |||\chi^*_{\sigma_{k'}}||| \right| \geq \frac{1}{n}$ for all $k' > k$. This can happen only for finitely many k's because $|||\cdot|||$ is an equivalent norm so it is bounded on the unit sphere of JT^*. $\square$

Now we assume that T is union of countably many antichains, $T = \bigcup_{m<\omega} R_m$, and that it verifies the conclusion of Lemma 8 for a decomposition $\bar{T} = \bigcup_{n<\omega} T_n$ and a function F, and we shall show that indeed $\bar{T}$ is the union of countably many antichains. For every $n < \omega$ and every finite subset A of natural numbers we consider the set

$$S_{n,A} = \left\{ \sigma \in \bar{T} : \sigma \in T_n \text{ and } F(\sigma) \subset \bigcup_{m\in A} R_m \right\}$$

This gives an expression of $\bar{T}$ as countable union $\bar{T} = \bigcup_{n,A} S_{n,A}$. We shall verify that this expression verifies condition (4) of Theorem 6. Suppose by contradiction that we had an infinite chain $\sigma_1 \prec \sigma_2 \prec \cdots$ inside a fixed $S_{n,A}$. First, since $S_{n,A} \subset T_n$ there exists k_0 such that $F(\sigma_k) \cap \sigma_{k+1} \neq \emptyset$ for every $k > k_0$, say $t_k \in F(\sigma_k) \cap \sigma_{k+1} \subset \bigcup_{m\in A} R_m$. Then $t_1 \prec t_2 \prec \cdots$ is an infinite chain of T contained in $\bigcup_{m\in A} R_m$ which is a finite union of antichains. This contradiction finishes the proof of Theorem 7.

4. Spaces with no strictly convex nor Kadec norms

In this section we give a criterion on a tree T in order that JT^* admits neither a Kadec norm nor a strictly convex norm. We recall that the downwards closure of a subset S of a tree T is defined as

$$\hat{S} = \{t \in T : \exists s \in S : t \preceq s\}.$$

Theorem 9. *Let T be a tree verifying the following properties:*

- (T1) *Every node of T has infinitely many immediate succesors.*
- (T2) *For any countable family of antichains $\{S_n : n < \omega\}$ there exists $t \in T$ such that $t \notin \bigcup_{n<\omega} \hat{S}_n$.*

Then there is neither a strictly convex nor a Kadec equivalent norm in JT^*.

Condition (T2) is called *Baire property* of the tree and condition (T1) is usually expressed saying that T is an *infinitely branching tree.* An example of a tree satisfying properties (T1) and (T2) is the tree whose nodes are the countable subsets of ω_1 with $s \prec t$ if s is an initial segment of t (property (T2) is proved by constructing a sequence $t_1 \prec t_2 \prec \cdots$ with $t_i \notin \hat{S}_i$ and taking $t \succ \bigcup t_i$). A refinement of this construction due to Todorčević [16] produces a tree with the additional property that all branches are countable, and this implies that for this tree JT is weakly Lindelöf determined [1]. This is the example discussed in Section 5.

Along the work of Haydon it is possible to find different results implying that if a tree Υ is an infinitely branching Baire tree, then $C_0(\Upsilon)$ (or certain spaces which can be related to it) has no Kadec or strictly convex norm, cf. [10], [9]. One may be tempted to use Theorem 5 in conjunction with these results to get Theorem 9. However, there is a difficulty since these properties (T1) and (T2) on T are not easily reflected on the completed tree $\bar{T}$. The tree $\bar{T}$ is never a Baire tree, since the set M of all maximal elements verifies that $\hat{M} = \bar{T}$, and even if we try to remove these maximal elements, the hypothesis that T is infinitely branching is weaker than the hypothesis that $\bar{T}$ is infinitely branching. We shall do it therefore by hand, using in any case, similar arguments as in Haydon's proofs.

We assume now that T satisfies (T1) and (T2), we fix an equivalent norm $(JT^*, |||\cdot|||)$ and we shall see that this norm is neither strictly convex nor a Kadec norm.

Lemma 10. *For any node of the tree $t \in T$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find another node $s \succ t$ and an element $x_s^{**} \in JT^{**}$ with $|||x_s^{**}|||^* = 1$ such that*

1. $\left|\sup\{|||\chi^*_{[0,u]}||| : u \succeq s\} - |||\chi^*_{[0,s]}|||\right| < \varepsilon.$
2. $x_s^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,u]}) \geq |||\chi^*_{[0,s]}||| - \varepsilon$ *whenever* $s \prec u$.

PROOF: First we take a node $t' \succ t$ such that

$$\left|\sup\{|||\chi^*_{[0,u]}||| : u \succeq t\} - |||\chi^*_{[0,t']}|||\right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

and we find $x^{**} \in JT^{**}$ with $|||x_s^{**}|||^* = 1$ such that $x^{**}(\chi_{[0,t']}) = |||\chi^*_{[0,t']}|||$. We consider the set S of all immediate successors of t' in the tree T which is an infinite antichain. Then, we can consider the projection

$$\pi_S^{**} : JT^{**} \longrightarrow X_S^{**} = \left(\bigoplus_{s\in S} X_s^{**}\right)_{\ell_2}$$

Since S is infinite, there must exist $s \in S$ such that $\|\pi_s^{**}(x^{**})\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

The elements $s \in T$ and $x_s^{**} = x^{**}$ are the desired. Namely, for any $u \succeq s$,

$$x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,u]}) = x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,t']}) + x^{**}(\chi^*_{[s,u]}),$$

and $\chi^*_{[s,u]} \in X_s^*$, so $\pi_s^*(\chi^*_{[s,u]}) = \chi^*_{[s,u]}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,u]}) &= x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,t']}) + x^{**}(\chi^*_{[s,u]}) \\
&= x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,t']}) + x^{**}(\pi_s^*(\chi^*_{[s,u]})) \\
&= x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,t']}) + \pi_s^{**}(x^{**})(\chi^*_{[s,u]}) \\
&\geq x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,t']}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\
&= |||\chi^*_{[0,t']}||| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\
&\geq |||\chi^*_{[0,s]}||| - \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

This guarantees in particular that $|||\chi^*_{[0,s]}||| \geq x^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,s]}) \geq |||\chi^*_{[0,t']}||| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. This together with the property which follows from the initial choice of t' gives also property (1) in the lemma and finishes the proof. $\square$

We construct by recursion, using Lemma 10, a sequence of maximal antichains of T, $\{S_n : n < \omega\}$ which are increasing (that is for every $t \in S_{n+1}$, there exists $s \in S_n$ with $s \prec t$) and such that for every $n < \omega$ and for every $s \in S_n$ there exists an element $x_s^{**} \in JT^{**}$ with $|||x_s^{**}|||^* = 1$ such that

1. $\left|\sup\{|||\chi^*_{[0,u]}||| : u \succ s\} - |||\chi^*_{[0,s]}|||\right| < \frac{1}{n}.$
2. $x_s^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,u]}) = x_s^{**}(\chi^*_{[0,s]}) \geq |||\chi^*_{[0,s]}||| - \frac{1}{n}$ whenever $s \prec u$.

Now, by property (T2), we can pick $t \in T \setminus \bigcup_{n<\omega} S_n$. We can find for t a sequence $s_1 \prec s_2 \prec \cdots \prec t$ with $s_n \in S_n$.

For any $t' \succeq t$ and for every $n < \omega$,

$$|||\chi^*_{[0,s_n]}||| - \frac{1}{n} \leq x^{**}_{s_n}(\chi^*_{[0,t']}) \leq |||\chi^*_{[0,t']}||| \leq \sup_{u \succeq s_n} |||\chi^*_{[0,u]}||| \leq |||\chi^*_{[0,s_n]}||| + \frac{1}{n}.$$

This implies that all the successors of t have the same norm $||| \cdot |||$ equal to the limit of the norms $|||\chi^*_{[0,s_n]}|||$. If we take t_1 and t_2 two immediate succesors of t, in addition, for every $n < \omega$

$$|||\frac{\chi^*_{[0,t_1]} + \chi^*_{[0,t_2]}}{2}||| \geq x^{**}_{s_n}\left(\frac{\chi^*_{[0,t_1]} + \chi^*_{[0,t_2]}}{2}\right) \geq |||\chi^*_{[0,s_n]}||| - \frac{1}{n}$$

and passing to the limit

$$|||\frac{\chi^*_{[0,t_1]} + \chi^*_{[0,t_2]}}{2}||| \geq |||\chi^*_{[0,t_1]}||| = |||\chi^*_{[0,t_2]}|||$$

and this shows that $||| \cdot |||$ is not a strictly convex norm.

If now we take a sequence of different immediate succesors of t, $\{t_n : n < \omega\}$, then $\chi^*_{\{t_n\}}$ is an element of norm one of $X^*_{t_n}$ and since

$$X^*_{\{t_n : n<\omega\}} = \left(\bigoplus_{n<\omega} X^*_{t_n}\right)_{\ell_2}$$

the sequence $(\chi^*_{\{t_n\}} : n < \omega)$ is isometric to the base of ℓ_2 and in particular it is weakly null. Therefore $\chi^*_{[0,t_n]}$ is a sequence in a sphere which weakly converges to $\chi^*_{[0,t]}$ which is in the same sphere. However $\|\chi^*_{[0,t_n]} - \chi^*_{[0,t]}\| = \|\chi^*_{[t_n,t_n]}\| = 1$ so this sequence does not converge in norm. This shows that $||| \cdot |||$ is not a Kadec norm.

5. About a tree of Todorčević

A subset A of ω_1 is called stationary if the intersection of A with every closed and unbounded subset of ω_1 is nonempty. We shall fix a set A such that both A and $\omega_1 \setminus A$ are stationary. The existence of such a set follows from a result of Ulam [13, Theorem 3.2].

Definition 11 (Todorčević)**.** We define T to be the tree whose nodes are the closed subsets of ω_1 which are contained in A and whose order relation is that $s \prec t$ if s is an initial segment of t.

First, T has property (T1) because if $t \in T$ and $\eta \in A$ verifies that $\eta > \max(t)$, then $t \cup \{\gamma\}$ is an immediate successor of t in T. On the other hand, T does not contain any uncountable chain. If $\{t_i\}i < \omega_1$ were an uncountable chain, then $\bigcup_{i<\omega_1} t_i$ is a closed an unbounded subset of ω_1, so it should intersect $\omega_1 \setminus A$, which is impossible. The difficult point is in showing that T verifies property (T2).

Theorem 12 (Todorčević)**.** *For any countable family of antichains* $\{S_n : n < \omega\}$ *there exists* $t \in T$ *such that* $t \notin \bigcup_{n<\omega} \hat{S}_n$.

PROOF: We suppose by contradiction that we have a family of antichains $\{S_n : n < \omega\}$ which does not verify the statement. We can suppose without loss of generality that every one of these antichains is a maximal antichain, and that they are increasing, that is, for every $t \in S_{n+1}$ there exists $s \in S_n$ such that $s \prec t$. What we know is that for every $t \in T$ we can find $t' \in \bigcup_{m<\omega} S_m$ such that $t \prec t'$. Moreover, since the antichains are taken maximal and increasing,

$(*)$ For every natural number n and for every $t \in T$ there exists $t' \in \bigcup_{m>n} S_m$ such that $t \prec t'$.

We construct a family $\{R_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ of subsets of T with the following properties:

1. R_ξ is a countable subset of $\bigcup_{n<\omega} S_n$.
2. $R_\xi \subset R_\zeta$ whenever $\xi < \zeta$.
3. If ξ is a limit ordinal, then $R_\xi = \bigcup_{\zeta<\xi} R_\zeta$.
4. If we set $\gamma_\xi = \sup\{\max(t) : t \in R_\xi\}$ then the following are satisfied
   - (a) $\gamma_\xi < \gamma_\zeta$ whenever $\xi < \zeta$.
   - (b) For every $\xi < \omega_1$, every $t \in R_\xi$, every $n < \omega$ and every $\eta \in A$ such that $\max(t) < \eta < \gamma_\xi$ there exists $t' \in R_\xi \cap \cup_{m>n} S_m$ such that $t \cup \{\eta\} \prec t'$.
   - (c) $\gamma_\xi \neq \max(t)$ for every $t \in R_\xi$.

These sets are constructed by induction on ξ. We set $R_0 = \emptyset$ and we suppose we have constructed R_ζ for every $\zeta < \xi$. If ξ is a limit ordinal, then we define $R_\xi = \bigcup_{\zeta<\xi} R_\zeta$. Notice that then $\gamma_\xi = \sup\{\gamma_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}$ and all properties are immediately verified for R_ξ provided they are verified for every $\zeta < \xi$.

Now, we suppose that $\xi = \zeta + 1$. In order that 4(b) is verified, we will carry out a saturation argument. We will find R_ξ as the union of a sequence $R_\xi = \bigcup_{n<\omega} R^n_\xi$.

First, we set $R^0_\xi = R_\zeta$ and $\gamma^0_\xi = \gamma_\zeta$. Because we know that property 4(b) is verified by R_ζ, we have guaranteed property 4(b) in R_ξ when $\eta < \gamma_\zeta$.

In the next step, we take care that 4(b) is verified for every $t \in R^0_\xi$ and $\eta = \gamma_\zeta$. That is, for every $t \in R^0_\xi$ and every $n < \omega$ we find, using property $(*)$, $t'_n \in \bigcup_{m>n} S_m$ such that $t \cup \{\gamma^0_\xi\} \prec t'_n$ and we set $R^1_\xi = R^0_\xi \cup \{t'_n : t \in R^0_\xi,\ n < \omega\}$ and $\gamma^1_\xi = \sup\{\max(s) : s \in R^1_\xi\}$.

If we have already defined R^n_ξ and $\gamma^n_\xi = \sup\{\max(s) : s \in R^n_\xi\}$ then we make sure that property 4(b) will be verified in R_ξ for any $\eta \leq \gamma^n_\xi$, that is for every every $n < \omega$, every $t \in R^n_\xi$ and every $\eta \in (max(t), \gamma^n_\xi]$, we find, by property $(*)$, an element $t'_{n\eta} \in \bigcup_{m>n} S_m$ such that $t \cup \{\gamma^0_\xi\} \prec t'_{n\eta}$ and we set

$$R^{n+1}_\xi = R^n_\xi \cup \{t'_{n\eta} : t \in R^0_\xi,\ n < \omega,\ \eta \in (\max(t), \gamma^n_\xi]\}$$

and $\gamma_\xi^{n+1} = \sup\{\max(s) : s \in R_\xi^{n+1}\}$.

Finally, setting $R_\xi = \bigcup_{n<\omega} R_\xi^n$, we will have that $\gamma_\xi = \sup_{n<\omega} \gamma_\xi^n$ and the construction is finished.

Now, we will derive a contradiction from the existence of the sets R_ξ. The set $\{\gamma_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ is a closed and unbounded subset of ω_1, so since A is stationary, there exists $\xi < \omega_1$ such that $\gamma_\xi \in A$. We will construct a sequence $t_1 \prec t_2 \prec \cdots$ of elements of R_ξ such that $t_n \in \bigcup_{m>n} S_m$ and $\gamma_\xi = \sup\{\max(t_n) : n < \omega\}$. Such a sequence leads to a contradiction, because in this case, $t = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty t_n \cup \{\gamma_\xi\}$ is a node of the tree with the property that for every n, $t \succ t_n \in S_{m_n}$, $m_n > n$, and this implies that $t \notin \bigcup_{n<\omega} \hat{S}_n$. The construction of the sequence t_n is done inductively as follows. An increasing sequence of ordinals $\{\eta_i : i < \omega\}$ converging to γ_ξ is chosen. If we already defined t_{n-1}, we find i with $max(t_n) < \eta_i$ and we use property 4(b) to find $t_n \in R_\xi \cap \bigcup_{m>n} S_m$ with $t_{n-1} \cup \{\eta_i\} \prec t_n$.

References

[1] S. A. Argyros and S. Mercourakis, *On weakly Lindelöf Banach spaces*, Rocky Mountains J. Math. **23** (1993), no. 2, 395–446.

[2] ———, *Examples concerning heredity problems of WCG Banach spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2005), no. 3, 773–785.

[3] ———, *A note on the structure of WUR Banach spaces*, Preprint (2005).

[4] R. E. Brackebusch, *James space on general trees*, J. Funct. Anal. **79** (1988), no. 2, 446–475.

[5] R. Deville, G. Godefroy, and V. Zizler, *Smoothness and renormings in Banach spaces*, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 64, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1993.

[6] B. Dushnik and E. W. Miller, *Partially ordered sets*, Am. J. Math. **63** (1941), no. 3, 600–610.

[7] M. Fabian and G. Godefroy, *The dual of every Asplund space admits a projectional resolution of the identity*, Studia Math. **91** (1988), no. 2, 141–151.

[8] J. Hagler and E. Odell, *A Banach space not containing l_1 whose dual ball is not weak* sequentially compact*, Illinois J. Math. **22** (1978), no. 2, 290–294.

[9] R. Haydon, *Baire trees, bad norms and the Namioka property*, Mathematika **42** (1995), no. 1, 30–42.

[10] R. Haydon, *Trees in renorming theory*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. **78** (1999), no. 3, 541–584.

[11] R. Haydon, A. Moltó, and J. Orihuela, *Spaces of functions with countably many discontinuities*, Preprint (2005).

[12] R. C. James, *A separable somewhat reflexive Banach space with nonseparable dual*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **80** (1974), 738–743.

[13] K. Kunen, *Combinatorics*, Handbook of Mathematical Logic, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 371–401.

[14] D. Kurepa, *Ensembles ordonnés et leurs sous-ensembles bien ordonnés*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **242** (1956), 2202–2203.

[15] A. Moltó, J. Orihuela, S. Troyanski, M. Valdivia, *A nonlinear transfer technique.* Preprint.

[16] S. Todorčević, *Trees and linearly ordered sets*, Handbook of set-theoretic topology, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 235–293.

[17] ———, *Representing trees as relatively compact subsets of the first Baire class*, Preprint (2005).

[18] S. L. Troyanski, *On a property of the norm which is close to local uniform rotundity*, Math. Ann. **271** (1985), no. 2, 305–313.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, 30100 ESPINARDO (MURCIA), SPAIN